



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/267,178	03/12/1999	LUIS ORTIZ	02324/019001	6678

26171 7590 08/12/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

ABELSON, RONALD B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2666
DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/267,178	ORTIZ ET AL.
	Examiner Ronald Abelson	Art Unit 2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The indicated allowability of independent claims 7, 14, 26, 31, and 33 is withdrawn in view reference(s) to Coile.

Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 14, 20, 21, 25, 26, 29, 31-33, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coile (US 6,298,063) in view of Terry (US 6,587,473).

Regarding claims 1 and 21, Coile teaches a method and apparatus for a computer telephony system (fig. 1).

The computer telephony platforms have resources that provide computer telephony services (fig. 1 box 102, 104).

There are service modules (fig. 1 box 112 A,B,C) residing on each of the platforms (fig. 1 box 112), wherein the service modules manipulate the resources according to platform-dependent protocols (TCP, col. 4 lines 14-15) to facilitate performance of computer telephony services for other service modules (servers are connected to one another, col. 4 lines 23-25), and communication among service modules uses packets (col. 4 lines 23-25).

Art Unit: 2666

There is inter-platform packet router (fig. 1 box 104) associated with the inter-platform interface, the inter-platform router routing message packets having inter-platform destination addresses (fig. 1 box 102).

Regarding claims 1 and 21, although Coile teaches the servers (fig. 1 box 112A-C) are connected to one another (col. 4 lines 23-25), the inventor fails to explicitly state communication among the service modules using message packets having a common, platform-independent protocol, an intra platform packet router for routing packets originating from a platform on which the intra-platform packet router resides and having an intra-platform destination address to a service module residing on the platform, the inter-platform packet router receiving from the intra-platform routers to one of the intra-platform routers residing on one of the platforms on which the service modules indicated by the inter-platform address reside.

Regarding claim 7, Coile teaches service modules (fig. 1 box 112A-C) to manipulate resource to facilitate the performance of computer telephony services for other service modules (servers are connected to one another, col. 4 lines 23-25), and each of the service modules manipulates one of the resources according to one of a plurality of diverse protocols (TCP, FTP,

Art Unit: 2666

col. 4 lines 14-25), and a packet router configured to route the message packets to the service modules based on a destination address included in the packet (fig. 1 box 200).

Regarding claims 14, 26, and 31, Coile teaches computer telephony platforms (fig. 1 box 104, 200, and 112) and service modules (fig. 1 box 112A-C) residing on the platforms, one of the service modules accessing resources on the platform according to one of a plurality of platform-dependent protocols (TCP, FTP, col. 4 lines 14-25) to facilitate performance of computer telephony services for other service modules (servers are connected to one another, col. 4 lines 14-25).

Regarding claim 33, controlling each of the service modules with the service requests to manipulate the resources of platform-dependent protocols to facilitate performance of the computer telephony services (col. 4 lines 23-25).

Regarding independent claims 1 and 21, Terry teaches an intra platform packet router (fig. 3 box 38) for routing packets originating from a platform (fig. 3 box 34, 34') on which the intra-platform packet router resides and having an intra-platform destination address to a service module residing on the platform, the inter-platform packet router (fig. 3 box 40) receiving from the intra-platform routers to one of the intra-

Art Unit: 2666

platform routers residing on one of the platforms on which the service modules indicated by the inter-platform address reside.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both Coile and Terry before him/her and with the teachings [a] as shown by Coile, a method and apparatus for a computer telephony system, and [b] as shown by Terry, an intra platform packet router for routing packets originating from a platform on which the intra-platform packet router resides and having an intra-platform destination address to a service module residing on the platform, the inter-platform packet router receiving from the intra-platform routers to one of the intra-platform routers residing on one of the platforms on which the service modules indicated by the inter-platform address reside, to be motivated to modify the system of Coile by incorporating the bridge function of Terry (fig. 1 box 38, col. 7 lines 24-26) within the local director (fig. 1 box 200) of Coile. This modification can be performed in hardware. This would improve the system of Coile since bridges are proven, reliable devices for routing packets within a network.

Regarding claims 1, 7, 14, 21, 26, 31, and 33, although Coile teaches the servers (fig. 1 box 112A-C) are connected to one another (col. 4 lines 23-24), the inventor fails to

Art Unit: 2666

explicitly state communication among the service modules using message packets communicated according to a common, platform-independent protocol.

The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to perform communication among the service modules using message packets communicated according to a common, platform-independent protocol. The service modules are (fig. 1 box 112A-C) can be viewed as a private network.

Communication between the servers would not be dependent upon accessing hardware outside the domain of the private network.

Therefore, the system designer would be free to write software tailor made for transmitting information between the servers.

This would be of benefit since the designer would be able to optimize the software to fit his specific needs.

Regarding claims 5, 13, 20, 25, 29, 32, 39, the computer telephony services include voice, fax, data messaging, video, and multi-media (TCP, col. 4 line 9).

3. Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 23, 27, 28, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coile as applied to claims 1, 7 above, and further in view of Halsall.

Art Unit: 2666

Coile fails to explicitly state the contents of the message packet.

Halsall teaches the TCP packet comprises a common set of commands (pg. 651, fig b: RST), as specified in claims 2, 8, 15, 22, 27, 36; a set of parameters (pg. 651, fig. a: Acknowledgment number), each of the commands being operative with respect to one of the parameters to define one of the computer telephony services), as specified in claims 2, 8, 15, 22, 27, 36; a source address indicating an address of one of the service modules originating the message packet (pg. 651, fig. a: Source port), as specified in claims 3, 9, 16, 23, 28, 37; a destination address indicating an address of one of the service modules to receive the message packet (pg. 651, fig. a: Source port), as specified in claims 3, 9, 16, 23, 28, 34, 35, 37; a command field (pg. 651, fig. b), as specified in claims 3, 9, 16, 23, 28, 37; and a parameter field (pg. 651, fig. a: Sequence number, Acknowledgement number, Header length), as specified in claims 3, 9, 16, 23, 28, 37.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both Coile and Halsall before him/her and with the teachings [a] as shown by Coile, a computer telephony system comprising: platforms having resources that provide computer telephony services, service modules residing on

Art Unit: 2666

each of the platforms, wherein the service modules manipulate the resources according to platform-dependent protocols to facilitate performance of computer telephony services for other service modules, and communication among service modules uses packets having a common, platform-independent protocol, intra-platform packet routers residing on the platforms configured to route message packets having intra-platform destination addresses to local service modules, and route message packets having inter-platform destination addresses to an inter-platform platform interface, and [b] as shown by Halsall, the TCP packet comprises a common set of commands and a set of parameters, each of the commands being operative with respect to one of the parameters to define one of the computer telephony services, a command field, and a parameter field, to be motivated to modify the system of Coile by transmitting standard TCP packets. This would improve the system since Coile's system uses the TCP protocol and by using standardized format, the system can be easily integrated with other networks.

4. Claims 6, 11, 18, 30, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coile as applied to claims 1, 7, 14, 26, and 33 above, and further in view of McConnell (US 6,108,307).

Art Unit: 2666

Coile teaches each of the service modules is capable of processing messages received from a plurality of the other service modules (col. 5 lines 55-56).

Coile fails to teach each of the service modules maintains a queue for receipt of message packets, the queue defining an order of processing of the message packets by the service module.

McConnell teaches each of the service modules maintains a queue for receipt of message packets, the queue defining an order of processing of the message packets by the service module (fig. 3, box Q1-4, 58, col. 5 lines 56-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both Coile and McConnell before him/her and with the teachings [a] as shown by Coile, a computer telephony system comprising: platforms having resources that provide computer telephony services, service modules residing on each of the platforms, wherein the service modules manipulate the resources according to platform-dependent protocols to facilitate performance of computer telephony services for other service modules, and communication among service modules uses packets having a common, platform-independent protocol, intra-platform packet routers residing on the platforms configured to route message packets having intra-platform destination

Art Unit: 2666

addresses to local service modules, routing message packets having inter-platform destination addresses to an inter-platform platform interface, and each of the service modules is capable of processing messages received from a plurality of the other service modules, and [b] as shown by McConnell, each of the service modules maintains a queue for receipt of message packets, the queue defining an order of processing of the message packets by the service module, to be motivated to modify the system of Coile by inserting a plurality of prioritized queues before each service manager. This would improve the system by allowing for receipt of messages by the service managers on a prioritized basis.

5. Claims 4, 10, 17, 24, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coile as applied to claims 1, 7, 14, 21, and 33 above, and further in view of Killian (US 6,064,671).

Although Coile teaches the servers may generally provide any type of TCP service, the inventor does not explicitly state each of the resources comprises one of a hardware device and a software object.

Killian teaches TCP supports the software protocol HTTP (col. 4 lines 59-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both Coile and Killian before him/her and with the teachings [a] as shown by Coile, a computer telephony system comprising: platforms having resources that provide computer telephony services, service modules residing on each of the platforms, wherein the service modules manipulate the resources according to platform-dependent protocols to facilitate performance of computer telephony services for other service modules, and communication among service modules uses packets having a common, platform-independent protocol, intra-platform packet routers residing on the platforms configured to route message packets having intra-platform destination addresses to local service modules, and route message packets having inter-platform destination addresses to an inter-platform platform interface, and [b] as shown by Killian, TCP supports the software protocol HTTP, to be motivated to modify the system of Coile by having the servers (fig. 1 box 1120 access the Internet (fig. 1 box 102) using HTTP. This would improve the system by providing a standardized method within TCP for access to the Internet.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 5/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claim 7, the applicant contends Coile does not disclose, "each of the service modules manipulates one of the resources according to one of a plurality of diverse protocols" (applicant: pg. 10 lines 13-18). However, as previously mentioned, Coile teaches both TCP and FTP (col. 4 lines 19-25).

Regarding independent claims 1, the amended claim teaches intra-platform packet routers (applicant: pg. 11 lines 5-9). The examiner maintains this feature would be obvious to one skilled in the art since Coile teaches the servers (fig. 1 box 112A-C) are connected. See discussion above.

Regarding independent claims 14, 21, 26, 31, and 33, the limitation of "each of the service modules manipulates one of the resources according to one of a plurality of diverse protocols" (applicant: pg. 11 lines 10-11) has been discussed in reference to independent claim 7.

Regarding the dependent claims 2,3,8,9,15,16,22,23,27,28, 6,11,18,30,40, 4,10,17,24, and 34-38, (applicant: pg. 11-12) the

Art Unit: 2666

examiner disagrees with the applicant's assertion that the limitations of the independent claims have not been met. See rejection to independent claims above.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Abelson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5622. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (703) 308-5463. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

ra
Ronald Abelson
Examiner
Art Unit 2666

August 7, 2003

MW
DANGTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/267,178
Art Unit: 2666

Page 14